

The reference does not teach or suggest varying one of the second or third velocities of the process to maintain the spacing of the indicia and the lines of termination. The rejection under 35 USC § 102(e) should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

35 USC §103(a) rejections:

The Office action has rejected claims 16 and 17 under 35 USC §103(a) over Durr, and claims 18-23 under 35 USC §103(a) over Durr in light of McNeil (US 4,687,153). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the reference, or combination of references, must teach or suggest each of the claimed limitations. As set forth above, the Durr reference does not teach or suggest all of the claim limitation of independent claim 9 from which claims 10-17 depend. Durr therefore fails to teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations of claims 16 and 17 and the rejection under 35 USC §103(a) of these claims should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Similarly, the combination of the Durr reference and the McNeil reference also fails to teach or suggest the claimed limitation of varying one of the second or third velocities to maintain the spacing of the lines of termination and the indicia. Neither Durr or McNeil, or the combination thereof, teaches or suggests this claimed limitation. The combination fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness and this rejection under 35 USC §103(a) should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

SUMMARY

In light of the above remarks, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider and allow claims 9-24 which remain in the application. Early and favorable action in the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

For: KEVIN BENSON MCNEIL

By: 

David K. Mattheis
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 48,683
(513) 634-7419

FAX RECEIVED

JUL 02 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

July 2, 2003
Customer No. 27752